

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04576 01 OF 03 281941Z

73

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 OES-03

NRC-05 NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 ACDE-00 /098 W

----- 123750

O R 281810Z AUG 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3278

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 USNATO 4576

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJ: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING AUGUST 28

REFS: A) USNATO 4254 DTG 081340Z AUG 75; B) USNATO 4496 DTG

261200Z AUG 75; C) USNATO 4253 DTG 081333Z AUG 75

BEGIN SUMMARY: SPC AGREED AD REFERENDUM TO AN

FRG PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE BRACKETS IN FIRST TIC OF

PARA 1 OF DRAFT GUIDANCE, BY STATING "THE ALLIES INDICATED THAT THIS

COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING FOR GROUND FORCE MANPOWER MIGHT BE SET AT

APPROXIMATELY 700,000 SOLDIERS ON EACH SIDE". CHAIRMAN'S PROPOSAL

ON ELIMINATING THE "PLUS" ADD-ON TO PARA 3 RE FURTHER EQUIPMENT

REDUCTIONS WAS SUPPORTED BY NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM. FOR THE

NETHERLANDS, THIS MEANT GIVING UP THE DUTCH LANGUAGE WHICH SUGHT

TO LEAVE THE DOOR OPEN FOR FURTHER EQUIPMENT REDUCTIONS IN

EXCHANGE FOR WESTERN PHASE II OBJECTIVES. FRG INTRODUCED A NEW

TEXT FOR PARAS 4 TO 9 (CEILINGS) IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE,

WHICH FRG REP CHARACTERIZED AS AN EFFORT AT REACHING A COMPROMISE

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04576 01 OF 03 281941Z

BY TAKING MOST OF THE US LANGUAGE. BELGIAN REP REITERATED

SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE BELGIAN VERSION OF THE CEILINGS

PARAGRAPHS, BUT APPEARED TO PREFER THE US VERSION OVER THE FRG

VERSION. NEXT SPC MEETING ON OPTION III IS TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER2.

END SUMMARY

1. REFERENCES IN THIS MESSAGE TO THE DRAFT GUIDANCE ARE TO THE TEXT IN REF A, WITH THE DELETION OF BRACKETS IN SECOND AND THIRD TIC OF PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE REPORTED IN REF B. REFERENCES IN THIS MESSAGE TO THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENT ARE TO THE TEXT IN REF C, WITH THE DELETION OF BRACKETS IN PARA 4 OF THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENT REPORTED IN REF B.

2. DANISH REP (VILLADSEN) HAD SOME GENERAL REMARKS TO MAKE UNDER INSTRUCTIONS. DENMARK SHARES THE GENERAL HELSINKI

SENTIMENT THAT PROGRESS SHOULD NOW BE MADE IN MBFR. THIS VIEW WAS REFLECTED IN THE RECENT NORDIC FOREIGN MINISTERS COMMUNIQUE. DENMARK BELIEVES THAT INCLUSION OF NUCLEAR ELEMENTS PRESENTS THE ONLY CHANCE FOR FORWARD MOVEMENT IN MBFR. DENMARK WILL SUPPORT ANY PROPOSAL FOR SUCH INCLUSION WHICH DOES NOT VIOLATE THE PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY. DANISH FLEXIBILITY REGARDING ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES SHOULD NOT BE REGARDED AS INDIFFERENCE.

2A. DANISH REP THEN STATED THAT DENMARK SHARES THE US VIEW THAT OPTION III SHOULD NOT RAISE ALLIED DEMANDS ON THE EAST REGARDING THE COMMON CEILING. RE CEILINGS ISSUES, HIS AUTHORITIES ARE ATTRACTED BY THE SIMPLICITY OF THE BELGIAN APPROACH, BUT DOUBT THAT IT IS A TENABLE POSITION. ON A PERSONAL BASIS, HE SAID HE THOUGH IT MIGHT BE USEFUL TO HAVE AN EARLY NAC DISCUSSION OF OPTION III.

3. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) SAID THAT THE HAGUE ATTACHES GREAT IMPORTANCE TO COMPLETION OF WORK ON GUIDANCE IN TIME FOR INTRODUCTION OF OPTION III AT THE OUTSET OF THE NEXT NEGOTIATING ROUND. THE ALLIES WOULD BE IN A DANGEROUS POSITION IF THE

GUIDANCE WERE EVEN ONE OR TWO WEEKS LATE. THE SOVIETS KNOW WE ARE CONSIDERING INCLUSION OF NUCLEAR ELEMENTS, AND MAY WELL MAKE A PROPOSAL OF THEIR OWN EARLY IN THE NEGOTIATING ROUND. HE ADDED ON A PERSONAL BASIS THAT HE COULD IMAGINE

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04576 01 OF 03 281941Z

THE NAC HAVING A DISCUSSION OPTION III EARLY IN SEPTEMBER, PERHAPS RECEIVING A PROGRESS REPORT FROM THE SPC CHAIRMAN.

4. FRG REP (CITRON) SAID THAT HE UNDERSTOOD THE DUTCH AND DANISH VIEWPOINTS. HOWEVER, SPC NEEDS TO DO ITS WORK THOROUGHLY, AND SHOULD NOT BE PUT UNDER TIME PRESSURE.

5. DRAFT GUIDANCE, PARA 1, FIRST TIC. FRG REP PROPOSED DELETING THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE FIRST TIC ("MIGHT" VERSUS "WOULD") AND SUBSTITUTING THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE: "THE ALLIES INDICATED THAT THIS COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING FOR GROUND FORCE MANPOWER MIGHT BE SET AT APPROXIMATELY 700,000 SOLDIERS ON EACH SIDE".

HE SAID BONN WAS PROPOSING THIS ENTENCE IN VIEW OF THE PREFERENCE
STATED BY BOTH US AND UK FOR "MIGHT" IN THIS TIC.
US REP (MOORE), UK REP (BAILES) AND NETHERLANDS REP ACCEPTED
THE FRG PROPOSAL AD REFERENDUM (PENDING CONFIRMATION FROM THEIR
AUTHORITIES).

6. DRAFT GUIDANCE, PARA 1, FINAL TIC. NETHERLANDS REP PROPOSED
THE FOLLOWING REVISION IN AN EFFORT TO RESOLVE
THE "MIGHT" VS "WOULD" PROBLEM IN THIS TIC: "THE
COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING WOULD BE EXTENDED TO INCLUDE AIR
MANPOWER IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. THE ALLIES PROPOSE THAT
THIS COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING BE SET AT APPROXIMATELY 900,000
MEN." US REP OBSERVED THAT THIS LANGUAGE WOULD STILL CALL FOR
AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST IN PHASE I ON A NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING.
HE BRIEFLY REVIEWED US POSITION.

7. DRAFT GUIDANCE, PARA 3. NETHERLANDS REP STATED THAT THE
HAGUE ACCEPTED THE CHAIRMAN'S SUGGESTION AT THE LAST
MEETING (PARA 6, REF B) TO ADD "IN EITHER PHASE" AT THE END OF
LAST SENTENCE IN PARA 3, AND TO DELETE THE "PLUS" ADD-ON. HE
SAID THE NETHERLANDS STILL BELIEVED IN THE QUALIFICATION IT
HAD PUT ON THE "PLUS" ADD-ON THAT THERE
WOULD BE NO FURTHER EQUIPMENT REDUCTION OFFER "IN
EXCHANGE FOR WESTERN PHASE I OBJECTIVES". THE NETHERLANDS WAS
YIELDING ON THIS POINT, AND ACCEPTING THE CHAIRMAN'S SUGGESTION,
BECAUSE OF THE STRONG OBJECTIONS EXPRESSED BY SOME COUNTRIES TO
THE DUTCH QUALIFICATION, AND BECAUSE OF THE DUTCH INTEREST IN
EARLY COMPLETION OF SPC WORK ON GUIDANCE ON OPTION III.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 04576 01 OF 03 281941Z

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 04576 02 OF 03 282001Z

73

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 OES-03

NRC-05 NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 ACDE-00 /098 W

----- 124017

O R 281810Z AUG 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3279

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 USNATO 4576

8. FRG REP SAID HE HAD INSTRUCTIONS TO STICK FIRMLY WITH THE "PLUS" ADD-ON (OF COURSE, WITHOUT THE DUTCH QUALIFICATION). BELGIAN REP (BURNY) NOTED THAT FRG WAS THE ONLY COUNTRY TO INSIST UPON THE "PLUS" ADD-ON. HE URGED FRG TO ACCEPT THE CHAIRMAN'S SUGGESTION, AND DROP THE "PLUS" ADD-ON. US REP NOTED THAT HE DID NOT YET HAVE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE CHAIRMAN'S SUGGESTION, BUT JOINED THE NETHERLANDS AND BELGIAN IN OPPOSING THE "PLUS" ADD-ON. CANADIAN REP (BACON) SAID THE "PLUS" ADD-ON WAS REDUNDANT, GIVEN THE SENTENCE IN THE MIDDLE OF PARA 3 THAT OPTION III IS A ONE TIME OFFER. HE SAID HE COULD GO ALONG WITH BELGIUM, NETHERLANDS, AND US ON DELETION OF THE "PLUS" ADD-ON. FRG REP REPLIED THAT THE ALLIES COULD NOT STRESS TOO STRONGLY THAT NO OTHER OFFER FOR REDUCTION OF ANY EQUIPMENT OF ANY KIND CAN BE HOPED FOR.

9. DRAFT GUIDANCE, PARA 4 TO 9. FRG REP INTRODUCED A TEXT TO REPLACE PARAS 4 TO 9 AS PRESENTLY CONTAINED IN THE VERSIONS SUPPORTED ON THE ONE HAND BY THE US ("EITHER" SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04576 02 OF 03 282001Z

AND "PLUS EITHER" PARAS) AND ON THE OTHER HAND BY THE FRG ("EITHER" AND "OR" PARAS). HE TERMED THIS AN EFFORT TO REACH A COMPROMISE ON THE CEILINGS PARAGRAPHS BY TAKING MOST OF THE US LANGUAGE. THE FRG TEXT FOLLOWS IN THE NEXT PARAGRAPH.

10 BEGIN FRG TEXT
AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 4 OF SPC (OT) N/4 (REV.)

4 (OLD 4): IN THEIR INITIAL PRESENTATIONS, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD AVOID DISCUSSING THE ISSUES OF WHAT ARMAMENTS SHOULD BE LIMITED AND THE NATURE OF SUCH LIMITATION. SUBSEQUENTLY IF THE EASTERN NEGOTIATORS, HAVING PROVIDED AN INSTRUCTED RESPONSE, PRESS FOR DETAILS AND IF, IN THE JUDGEMENT OF THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS, THE RESPONSE SHOWS SERIOUS EASTERN INTEREST IN AN AGREEMENT INCORPORATING THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL, THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES MAY BE OUTLINED IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING LIMITATIONS:

5 (FROM OLD 5): - THE US NUCLEAR REDUCTIONS WOULD RESULT IN LIMITATIONS ON US NUCLEAR WARHEADS, US SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILE LAUNCHERS FOR BALLISTIC MISSILES OF OVER 500 KILOMETER RANGE, AND US AIRCRAFT OF NUCLEAR-CAPABLE MODELS;

- THE NUMBER OF EACH OF THESE US ELEMENTS IN THE AREA

OF REDUCTIONS COULD NOT EXCEED THE NUMBER IN THE AREA FOLLOWING PHASE I REDUCTIONS, WITH SUITABLE EXCEPTIONS TO PERMIT NORMAL TRAINING AND EXERCISES;

6 (FROM GERMAN "OR" VERSION)

THE NUMBER OF SOVIET MAIN BATTLE TANKS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS COULD NOT EXCEED THE NUMBER IN THE AREA FOLLOWING PHASE I REDUCTIONS WITH SUITABLE EXCEPTIONS TO PERMIT NORMAL TRAINING AND EXERCISES. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THIS HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE ALLIED POSITION.

7 (FROM T) "PLUS EITHER" VERSION)

THE SOVIETS WOULD NOT INCREASE THEIR NUCLEAR ELEMENTS
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04576 02 OF 03 282001Z

ANALOGOUS TO THOSE WITHDRAWN BY THE US BEGIN BRACKET
IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO UNDERMINE THE BASIS OF THE AGREEMENT
END BRACKET.

8. (FROM 8 "PLUS EITHER" VERSION:)

SHOULD THE EAST IN RETURN ASK IF LIMITS WOULD BE IMPOSED ON US TANKS, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD ANSWER, AS APPROPRAITE, THAT SOME CONSTRAINT ON THE LEVEL OF US MAIN BATTLE TANKS - IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT US TANKS WOULD NOT BE INCREASED IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO UNDERMINE THE BASIS OF THE AGREEMENT - COULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE WEST AS PART OF THE SATISFACTORY PHASE I AGREEMENT. IT SHOULD ALSO BE MADE CLEAR AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME THAT, BEFORE ACCEPTING SUCH LIMITATIONS, THE AGREEMENT MUST ALLOW FOR RESTORATION OF TANK STOCKS TO EARLIER LEVELS.

9 (FROM 7 GERMAN "OR" VERSION)

IF THE EAST ASKS FOR LIMITS ON ALLIED NUCLEAR ELEMENTS AND ALLIED MAIN BATTLE TANKS, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD ANSWER, AS APPROPRIATE, THAT LIMITS ON ALLIED NUCLEAR ELEMENTS AND ALLIED MAIN BATTLE TANKS ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE TO THE WEST
BEGIN BRACKET; THE PREVIOUSLY OFFERED ALLIED NO-INCREASE COMMITMENTS ON AIR AND GROUND MANPOWER OFFER ADEQUATE ASSURANCE THAT THE PROPOSED PHASE I AGREEMENT WOULD NOT BE CIRCUMVENTED END BRACKET.

10 (FROM OLD "PLUS" VERSION BEGIN BRACKET 9 END BRACKET
BEGIN BRACKET 8 END BRACKET

IF THE EAST SEEKS STILL FURTHER DETAILS, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD ANSWER, AS APPROPRIATE, THE CLEARLY, FURTHER DETAILS WOULD NEED TO BE AGREED; E.G., ON WHICH US AIRCRAFT MODELS AND SOVIET TANK MODELS WOULD BE SUBJECT TO THE LIMIT; BEGIN BRACKET ON THE FORM

OF THE RECIPROCAL PROVISION AFFECTING SOVIET NUCLEAR
ELEMENTS, END BRACKET ON EXCEPTIONS FOR TRAINING AND EXERCISES,
ETC. END BRACKET
END FRG TEXT

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 04576 02 OF 03 282001Z

11. BELGIAN REP OBSERVED THAT FRG TEXT STILL MAINTAINS
PARALLELISM BETWEEN TANKS AND NUCLEAR ELEMENTS. THE US TEXT
WAS MORE NUANCED IN THIS REGARD. BELGIAM
CONTINUES TO SUPPORT ITS OWN CONCLUDING "OR" VERSION OF THE
CEILINGS PARAGRAPHS. HE REITERATED THE DANGERS BELGIUM SEES
IN LINKING TANKS WITH NUCLEAR ELEMENTS, AND ADDED THAT SUCH
A LINKAGE COULD CAUSE PROBLEMS FOR VERIFICATIN, GIVEN THE
ALLIED NEED TO VERIFY WITHDRAWAL OF THE SOVIET TANK ARMY, AND
ALLIED UNWILLINGNESS TO PERMIT INTRUSIVE SOVIET INSPECTION OF
WITHDRAWAL OF US NUCLEAR ELEMENTS. HE REITERATED BELBIAN
VIEW THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD START WITH A MINIMAL OFFER ON
CEILINGS AS A TACTICAL MATTER. US REP COMMENTED BRIEFLY ON
BELGIAN POSITION ALONG LINES OF WASHINGTON GUIDANCE.
(COMMENT: BELGIAN REP, ALTHOUGH MAINTAINING BELGIAN POSITION
ON CEILINGS, APPEARED TO BE EXPRESSING A PREFERENCE FOR
PRESENT US TEXT VIS-A-VIS FRG VERSION. WE NOTE THAT WHEN
FRG FIRST PROPOSED INTRODUCING THE OLD CATEGORIES 1, 2 AND 3
INTO THE CEILINGS PARAGRAPHS OF THE GUIDANCE, BELGIAN REP
CRITICIZED FRG MOVE AS CONTRARY TO EFFORT IN SPC OVER LAST
SEVERAL WEEKS TO AVOID PARALLELISM BETWEEN TANKS AND NUCLEAR
ELEMENTS. THIS WOULD APPEAR TO INDICATE PROBABILITY THAT
WHEN BELGIUM MOVES FROM ITS OWN POSITION ON CEILINGS IT WILL
MOVE MORE TOWARD THE US POSITION THAN THE FRG POSITION.)

12. US REP ASKED WHY THE NEW GERMAN TEXT DROPPED
THE FIRST SENTENCE IN PRESENT DRAFT GUIDANCE IN
BRACKETS AFTER "EITHER" (I.E., THE
SENTENCE BEGINNING "IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION FROM EASTERN
NEGOTIATORS AS TO WHETHER....". HE NOTED THAT FRG HAD
APPEARED TO ACCEPT THE "EITHER" SECTION, AND THAT THE FRG
"OR" SECTION HAD BEEN AN ALTERNATIVE NOT TO THE "EITHER" SECTION
BUT TO THE "PLUS EITHER" SECTION. FRG REP SAID HE WOULD CHECK
WITH HIS AUTHORITIES.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 04576 03 OF 03 282010Z

73
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 OES-03

NRC-05 NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 ACDE-00 /098 W

----- 124296

O R 281810Z AUG 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3280

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 USNATO 4576

13. UK REP SAID THAT ALTHOUGH LONDON WILL STUDY THE NEW FRG TEXT, SHE WISHED TO POINT OUT THAT THE MAIN ELEMENT OF UK CONCERN WITH THE OLD FRG TEXT IS STILL PRESENT, I.E., THE PLACING DIRECTLY AFTER THE TICS ON LIMITATIONS ON US NUCLEAR ELEMENTS ON A TIC ON LIMITATIONS ON SOVIET MAIN BATTLE TANKS.

14. DRAFT SUPPLEMEMNT, PARA 3. FRG REP PROPOSED THE FOLLOWING TO REPLACE THE "OR" VERSION OF PARA 3, CONCERNING DEFINITION OF THE COMMON CEILING. HE SAID THIS CHANGE WOULD EXPRESS FRG VIEW ON THIS ISSUE BETTER THAN PRESENT "OR" VERSION.

15 BEGIN FRG TEXT

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 3 OF SPC (OT) N/2 (REV.)

IN THE PHASE I AGREEMENT ALL THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WILL COLLECTIVELY AGREE TO A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING, APPROPRIATELY DEFINED, ON GROUND BEGIN BRACKET AND AIR FORCE END BRACKET MANPOWER IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. THE ALLIANCE MUST HAVE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04576 03 OF 03 282010Z

REACHED AGREEMENT ON THE LEVEL OF THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING AMOUNTING TO BEGIN BRACKET 700.000 END BRACKET TO BEGIN BRACKET 900.000 END BRACKET MEN.

AN APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING MUST CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS:

EITHER

- AGREEMENT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING IN THE II PHASE

- AGREEMENT TO THE COLLECTIVE CHARACTER OF A COMMON CEILING BEGIN BRACKET AND TO THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF THE REDUCTION COMMITMENTS END BRACKET

- UNDERSTANDING WITH THE EAST AS TO THE LEVEL BEGIN BRACKET
S END BRACKET OF GROUND BEGIN BRACKET AND AIR END BRACKET FORCE
PERSONNEL OF BOTH SIDES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS FOLLOWING
PHASE I REDUCTIONS.

OR

- AGREEMENT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMON COLLECTIVE
CEILING IN THE II PHASE

- AGREEMENT TO THE COLLECTIVE CHARACTER OF A COMMON
CEILING BEGIN BRACKET AND TO THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF THE
REDUCTION COMMITMENTS END BRACKET

- AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST TO AN ILLUSTRATIVE FIGURE
FOR THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING, SAY BEGIN BRACKET
700.000 END BRACKET BEGIN BRACKET 900.000 END BRACKET MEN
ON EACH SIDE.
END FRG TEXT

16. DRAFT SUPPLEMENT, PARA 5. MC REP (BRANSON) SAID THAT
SHAPE HAD LIFTED THE RESERVATION WHICH IT HAD PLACED ON THIS
PARAGRAPH AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING (PARA 12, REF B). HE SAID
SHAPE SIMPLY WISHED TO PLACE A MARKER THAT IT WAS STILL LOOKING
AT THIS PARAGRAPH, AND MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT HAVE SOMETHING TO SAY
ABOUT IT. IF SHAPE HAD A COMMENT ON THIS PARA, IT WOULD CLARIFY
ITS VIEW BY SEPTEMBER 4. MC REP TOLD US PRIVATELY THAT THE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04576 03 OF 03 282010Z

PROBLEM AROSE AT THE SHAPE STAFF LEVEL, AND THE PERSON WHO RAISED
THE CONCERN HAS BEEN ON LEAVE. AS MC REP UNDERSTANDS IT, THE
PROBLEM IS WITH THE THIRD SENTENCE IN PARA 5, AND ON
WHAT SCOPE THERE WOULD BE FOR INCLUSION AMONG THE 1,000
WITHDRAWN WARHEADS OF WARHEADS AVAILABLE BECAUSE OF REDUCTION
OF POC SUPPORT FOR A SYSTEM AFTER REPEAT AFTER THE US NUCLEAR
REDUCTIONS WERE IMPLEMENTED.

17. ACTION REQUESTED: IF POSSIBLE IN TIME FOR NEXT SPC MEETING
WHICH WILL BE TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2:

A. CONFIRMATION THAT WE MAY ACCEPT FRG PROPOSAL CONCERNING
PARA 1, FIRST TIC, OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. (SEE PARA 5 ABOVE).

B. GUIDANCE ON WHETHER WE MAY ACCEPT THE CHAIRMAN'S
SUGGESTION FOR DELETION OF THE "PLUS" ADD-ON TO PARA 3 OF THE
DRAFT GUIDANCE, AS REQUESTED IN PARA 16, REF B. (SEE ALSO
PARA 7 ABOVE).

C. COMMENT ON NEW FRG TEXT FOR PARAS 4 TO 9 OF THE DRAFT
GUIDANCE (SEE PARA 10 ABOVE). WE NOTE THAT UK AND THE
NETHERLANDS SUPPORT THE PRESENT US VERSION OF THESE PARAS, AND
BELGIUM WHILE MAINTAINING ITS OWN VERSION APPEARS TO PREFER
THE US VERSION OVER THE FRG VERSION. THE NEW FRG VERSION,

LIKE THE OLD ONE, DIFFERS WITH THE US VERSION MORE IN PRESENTATION AND TACTICAL FLEXIBILITY THAN IN SUBSTANCE. THE NEW VERSION IS AN IMPROVEMENT, BUT STILL RAISES THE ISSUE CITED BY UK REP, AND LINKS ALLIED NUCLEAR ELEMENTS AND TANKS IN THE SAME PARAGRAPH. SINCE THE PRESENTATIONAL AND TACTICAL FLEXIBILITY AFFORDED BY THE PRESENT US VERSION APPEAL TO THE UK AND NETHERLANDS, AND MIGHT HELP DRAW BELGIUM AWAY FROM ITS OWN POSITION, WE SUGGEST US AWAIT REACTION FROM THESE COUNTRIES BEFORE STATING DEFINITIVE POSITION ON NEW FRG TEXT. IT WOULD NEVERTHELESS BE HELPFUL TO HAVE WASHINGTON VIEWS ON NEW FRG TEXT FOR USE AT MISSION'S DISCRETION AT SEPTEMBER 2 SPC MEETING, OR IF THAT IS NOT POSSIBLE, AT SEPTEMBER 4 SPC MEETING.

3. ALTHOUGH CONCERN IN PARA 16 ABOVE MAY NEVER SURFACE, WE WOULD APPRECIATE BRIEF INSTRUCTED COMMENT IN CASE IT DOES.
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 28 AUG 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: izenbei0
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO04576
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750897/abbrzltq.tel
Line Count: 451
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 9
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 4254 DTG 081340Z AUG 75; B) USNATO 4496 DTG 261200Z AUG 75; C) USNATO 4253 DTG 081333Z AUG 75
BEGIN SUMMARY: SPC AGREED AD REFERENDUM TO AN FRG PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE BRACKETS IN FIRST TIC OF PARA 1 OF
DRAFT GUIDANCE, BY STATING "THE ALLIES INDICATED THAT THIS COMMON COLLECTIVE
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: izenbei0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 08 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <08 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <24 SEP 2003 by izenbei0>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING AUGUST 28
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON

USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006